

# **2015-2019 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

## **Lewis-Clark Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization**



Public Comment Period – July 6, 2014 through August 13, 2014  
Recommended Approval by MPO TAC: August 27, 2014  
Adopted by the Policy Board: September 10, 2014

## **LEWIS-CLARK VALLEY MPO POLICY BOARD MEMBERSHIP**

City of Asotin, Washington

Mervin Schneider

City of Clarkston, Washington

Kathleen Warren

City of Lewiston, Idaho

RJ Johnson, Michael Collins, Shannon Grow

Asotin County, Washington

Brian Shinn, Jim Bridges

Nez Perce County, Idaho

Bob Tippet

## **EX-OFFICIO MEMBERSHIP**

Port of Lewiston, Idaho

Port of Clarkston, Washington

Lewiston-Nez Perce County Regional Airport Authority

Lewiston Transit

Asotin County PTBA

Nez Perce Tribe

Washington State Department of Transportation

Idaho Transportation Department

Palouse RTP

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	1
LIST OF TABLES.....	1
LEWIS-CLARK VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION .....	3
INTRODUCTION .....	4
DEVELOPMENT OF THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.....	4
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN GOALS/OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES .....	5
AIR QUALITY CERTIFICATION STATEMENT.....	6
FINANCIAL PLAN.....	7
State and Federal Funding Categories .....	7
Local Funding Categories .....	9
Transit Funding Sources .....	2
Additional Transit Funding Opportunities.....	3
LEWIS-CLARK VALLEY MPO SELF CERTIFICATION .....	13
Certification.....	13
WASHINGTON SELF-CERTIFICATION .....	14
IDAHO SELF CERTIFICATION .....	15

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Local Agency Revenue.....	1
Table 2: Local Agency Revenues for Transportation.....	2
Table 3: Transit Agency Revenues .....	3
Table 4: Project List.....	4



## **LEWIS-CLARK VALLEY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

The Lewis-Clark Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (LCVMPO) is the state certified Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Lewis-Clark Valley. The metropolitan area is comprised of the cities of Asotin and Clarkston, Washington, Asotin County, Washington, the city of Lewiston, Idaho, and Nez Perce County, Idaho. A memorandum of understanding (MOU) between its member agencies and the states of Idaho and Washington, defines the responsibilities for cooperatively carrying out transportation planning and programming in the metropolitan area. Planning activities of the LCVMPO are defined in the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).

The Lewis-Clark Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization is run by a Policy Board (PB) who are locally elected appointed officials and/or appointed persons to provide leadership for regional transportation planning. The PB is supported by the MPO- Technical Advisory Committee (MPO-TAC) which is comprised of professionals who deal with transportation issues for their public agency whether it is for a city, county, transit agency, tribe, port, airport, multi-modal interest, or state. The metropolitan planning organization also provides part-time staff support to both the PB and MPO-TAC in fulfilling all federal regulations governing MPOs as found in 23 CFR 450.

The primary method for accomplishing the mission of LCVMPO is by using a continuous, cooperative, and comprehensive (the 3C's) planning process that results in regional multi-modal transportation plans and programs that anticipate the social, economic, and environmental needs of the metropolitan area. Some of the required federal products of this process are the Long-Range Transportation Plan – LRTP (23CFR450.322), the Transportation Improvement Program – TIP (23CFR450.324), and the Unified Planning Work Program – UPWP (23CFR450.308). The LCVMPO participates with the Palouse Regional Transportation Planning Organization (P-RTPO) on planning efforts of a larger regional nature in Washington.

LCVMPO also uses the 3C method when working with the Palouse – Regional Transportation Planning Organization (P-RTPO), a Washington State recognized organization that performs regional transportation planning in rural areas. P-RTPO is an Ex-officio member of the Policy Board and a member of the MPO-Technical Advisory Committee.

## **INTRODUCTION**

In 2003, The Lewis-Clark Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (LCVMPO) was designated as an official MPO. The LCVMPO is a bi-state MPO that includes the City of Lewiston, ID, the Cities of Clarkston and Asotin, WA, as well as portions of Nez Perce County, Idaho, and Asotin County, Washington.

The 2015-2019 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is the culmination of various transportation planning activities undertaken by the MPO as well as individual jurisdictions in the metropolitan area, including ITD, WSDOT, Lewiston Transit and the Asotin County Public Transportation Benefit Area (PTBA). The 2015-2019 TIP fulfills state and federal requirements for having coordinated and reviewed prospective transportation projects for consistency with local and regional goals and finds the projects within this document to be beneficial to the growth and livelihood of the metropolitan area. Adoption and approval of this program permits the individual projects to compete for federal and state funding. Projects with secured funding are sent to either WSDOT for inclusion into the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) in Washington or ITD for inclusion into the Idaho Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) in Idaho, allowing for the obligation of these secured funds to move forward.

All projects using federal funds are required to be in both the Metropolitan-TIP and State TIP. Furthermore, any project that is considered regionally significant is required to be in both TIPs, even if it is not receiving any federal funds. SAFETEA-LU requires MPOs to consider eight (8) planning factors (23CFR450.306(a)) in their consideration of projects.

## **DEVELOPMENT OF THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

The Lewis-Clark Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization is required to complete a Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) that complies with 23CFR450.324. During TIP development, the MPO consults with local and state officials, transit agencies, and other agencies which have responsibilities for transportation activities. Public input is afforded at the LCVMPO level with open public meetings of the monthly Policy Board and MPO-TAC meetings during the citizen comment period. A public notice will be placed in the local newspaper explaining when meetings are and how to provide public comment.

Modifications to this MTIP may be made prior to the adoption of the 2016-2020 MTIP. The process with which an amendment can be done is as follows:

Minor Modifications – Moving a project within the five years of the TIP, changes to federal funding sources, changes between phases of a project, and minor typographical errors may be made by the MPO Director, with notification to the MPO Policy Board at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

Administrative Modifications – Changes to a project’s total programmed amount of 30% or less, adding a prior phase of a project not previously authorized, and minor changes in error such as improvement type, project limits, functional classification, typographical errors, transposed numbers, etc. may be made by the Policy Board at their regularly scheduled meetings.

MTIP Amendments – Adding a project, deleting a project, changes to a project’s total programmed amount of more than 30%, major scope changes, addition of a future phase of a project, and the addition of federal funds to a project that does not have federal funds listed must be advertised and a public comment period afforded of at least 30 days prior to the Policy Board’s decision of the amendment.

## **REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN GOALS/OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES**

On September 17, 2013 the MPO Policy board approved Valley Destinations 2040, which is the most current update of the LRTP.

### **Goals:**

The Goals identified here reflect conformance with Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (MAP-21) planning factors and performance measures. Based on the public Participation done in the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update, each goal was weighted to reflect the community’s level of importance to the region. The 7 goals and associated objectives were developed to be consistent with the 8 planning factors, to guide LCVMPPO in implementing the plan at the regional level.

- 1) Maintain the Existing Transportation System
  - Maintain and repair existing roads, bridges, sidewalks, and/or multi-use trails to good condition.
  - Increase access to additional modes by replacing and retrofitting transportation in the existing system to allow for a wide range of transportation options.
- 2) Support Economic Vitality
  - Facilitate the movement of goods and freight to commercial and industrial centers.
  - Support new and existing commercial and industrial development by ensuring access by multiple transportation modes.
  - Provide attractive and convenient transportation facilities that attract and retain business, young professionals, families and older adults.
- 3) Promote Consistency Between Land Use and Transportation Plans to Enhance Mobility and Accessibility.
  - Provide a transportation network which supports existing and future high trip destination areas including city centers, and corridors.
  - Develop projects to catalyze centers including infill and redevelopment areas.
- 4) Provide Safe and Secure Transportation.
  - Support transportation programs and design improvements which reduce crashes and improve safety of all modes. One of the eight planning factors of the current federal transportation law MAP-21 is insuring the safety of travelers. Improving roadways

and intersections that experience a high number of crashes or locations with high crash rates have the greatest potential in reducing crashes.

- Facilitate the rapid movement of first responders and support incident management during times of emergency.
- 5) Improve the Efficiency, Performance and Connectivity of a Balanced Transportation System.
- Minimize travel times by methods, such as providing direct routes between destinations, providing additional mixed-use development capacity, use of intelligent transportations systems and transportation demand management tools, and/or providing information to the public to allow informed transportation decisions.
  - Promote Complete Streets concepts so that streets are planned, designed, and operated to maximize safe access for all users including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and transit riders of all ages and abilities.
- 6) Maximize the Cost Effectiveness of Transportation.
- Plan for a transportation system that is affordable, sustainable, and makes the best use of public financial resources.
- 7) Protect the Environment and Conserve Resources
- Reduce fossil fuel consumption by minimizing travel time and providing access to alternative modes.
  - Minimize vehicle miles of travel by promoting a variety of transportation choices.
  - Minimize impact to natural environments by taking opportunities to couple transportation projects with protections and enhancement of environmental resources.

## **AIR QUALITY CERTIFICATION STATEMENT**

No part of the Lewis-Clark Valley is in non-attainment status for any air quality pollutants.



## FINANCIAL PLAN

SAFETEA-LU followed by MAP-21, requires that regional transportation plans be fiscally constrained and that the project listing found within it is actually reasonably fundable with foreseeable transportation funding over the life of the plan document. In order to use the LRTP as a goal and future vision document, the MTIP becomes the staging area for projects to be funded and constructed to implement the LRTP. Starting with ISTEA and continued in MAP-21, legislation requires that projects identified in the Long Range Transportation Plan for the MPO must be developed with financial constraint; the proposed projects and their costs must be reasonably foreseeable for project funding.

In general, there are two major funding sources available for transportation to the Lewis-Clark Valley MPO: State and Federal funds and Local funds. The State and Federal funds include non-discretionary funds for specific purposes and discretionary funds for improvements identified in the LRTP planning process. Local funds provide operations and maintenance of the transportation system and provide a local match for State and Federal funds.

### State and Federal Funding Categories

There are a number of distinct funding categories that will finance transportation in the Lewis-Clark Valley. Each of these larger categories have sub components that make up the entire financial picture for the category. The funding categories are outlined below. These funding categories have variable local match rates.

#### Non-Discretionary Funds

- **The National Highway System (NHS)** program provides funding for improvements to rural and urban roads that are part of the NHS, including the Interstate System and designated connections to major intermodal terminals. The NHS includes the Interstate Highway System (IHS), as well as other roads important to the nation's economy, defense, and mobility. NHS, consists of major roads in the United States, including the interstate system; other routes identified for their strategic defense characteristics; routes providing access to major ports, airports, public transportation, and intermodal transportation facilities; and principal arterials that provide regional service. With MAP-21, NHS also includes all arterial roads and higher that are registered on the Federal Functional Road Classification. Funding in this category may be used for a wide-variety of projects. In addition to roadway construction, operational and maintenance improvements, eligible projects includes start-up for traffic management and control, infrastructure-based intelligent transportation system capital improvements, fringe and corridor parking, carpool and vanpool projects, bicycle and pedestrian projects, and wetlands and natural habitat mitigation. In certain circumstances, transit projects in the corridor are also allowed if they benefit the NHS facility. Publicly-owned intracity and intercity bus terminals are also eligible.

- The **Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)** is a core Federal-aid program. The goal of the program is to achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads, including non-State-owned public roads and roads on tribal lands. The HSIP requires a data-driven, strategic approach to improving highway safety on all public roads that focuses on performance.
- **Pavement Preservation (PP)** is new under MAP-21 and promotes the concepts of asset management and preservation. Asset management defined as a structured sequence of maintenance, preservation, repair, rehabilitation, and replacement actions that will achieve and sustain a desired state of good repair over the lifecycle of the assets at minimum practicable cost.
- **Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program (BR)** was established to fund the replacement or rehabilitation of structurally deficient or functionally obsolete public roadway bridges. The bridge candidate must be classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete according to federal guidelines. Candidate bridge replacements must have a structure inventory and appraisal (SI&A) sufficiency rating of less than 50 and average daily traffic of at least 25 vehicles. Bridge rehabilitation candidates must have an SI&A sufficiency rating of 80 or less and average daily traffic of at least 25 vehicles.

#### **Discretionary State and Federal Funds**

- **Surface Transportation Program –Urban (STP-U) (Idaho and Washington):** Washington and Idaho Urbanized Areas receive an annual allocation of Federal STP funds for use on identified capital projects. This program was established to: Aid public road jurisdictions with funding for any road or bridge projects on the federal-aid system, which includes all federal functional class routes except local and rural minor collectors; provide funding for transit capital improvements; provide funding for bicycle and pedestrian facilities; and provide funding for transportation planning activities. STP-U funds require a local match, which is 13.5% in Washington and 7.36% in Idaho. These funds are federal funds and are discretionary based on the project identification, prioritization, and selection process from the LRTP planning process but are awarded by LCVMPPO Policy Board. Typically, these funds are used for roadways including multi-modal enhancements.
- The **Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)** is a new federal program authorized under MAP-21. TAP provides funding for programs and projects defined as transportation alternatives, including on- and off-road pedestrian and bicycle facilities, infrastructure projects for improving non-driver access to public transportation and enhanced mobility, community improvement activities, and environmental mitigation; recreational trail program projects; Safe Routes to School projects; and projects for the planning, design, or construction of boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former Interstate System routes or other divided highways. TAP funds are competitive at the State level in Idaho and the Palouse Regional Transportation Planning Organization (PRTPO) level in Washington.
- The **Washington Transportation Improvement Board (TIB)** offers a number of different funding programs to the State's small cities. Cities and towns with a population of under 5,000 are eligible for funding from programs that reconstruct or maintain the transportation infrastructure. Small City Arterial, Preservation, and Sidewalk Funds are distributed across three regions based on small city populations.

- **Transit (Idaho and Washington):** Within the urbanized area, both the City of Lewiston and the Asotin County PTBA are direct recipients of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) allocations. Generally, these funds require a 50% local match for operating, 20% local match for capital investments, and 15% local match for rolling stock.
- **Aviation Funding (Idaho):** The majority of Aviation funding coming into the LCVMPPO area is on the Idaho side, since the Lewiston Nez Perce County Regional Airport serves the entire metro area, and is located in Idaho.
- **Hazard Elimination (Washington):** The State of Washington disperses funds specifically for the improvement of unsafe roadway situations.
- **MPO Planning Funds:** These funds are used to ensure the Coordinated, Comprehensive, and Continuous (3C) Planning Process for transportation in the Lewis-Clark valley.

## Local Funding Categories

In addition to State and Federal funds, there are a number of local funds invested in the regional transportation system. These funds are primarily for roadway operations and maintenance, and also provide the necessary local match for Federal STP-U, TAP funds, and transit funding. These include the following.

### Local Agencies in Washington

City of Asotin: All funding that is spent on operations and maintenance comes out of the City's General Fund. The average annual funds for operations and maintenance is \$85,000. The City has also been successful in receiving Washington State Transportation Improvement Board (TIB) grants.

The City of Asotin contracts for many of its services related to roads, including engineering, sweeping, and pavement preservation. The City's budget for maintenance varies from year to year depending on the amount of pavement preservation activities. Thus, the funding in Asotin is a little more fluid between maintenance and operations expenditures.

City of Clarkston: The City of Clarkston receives approximately \$150,000 in fuel tax annually that is dedicated to street maintenance and operations. The City also allocates 50% of the property tax revenue, or about \$450,000 annually, to the street fund. The City spends between \$550,000 and \$700,000 annually on street maintenance and operations.

Asotin County: Asotin County uses three main sources of revenue to fund their roadway improvement and maintenance activities. Fuel taxes account for approximately \$1.5 million. The County also collects \$1.1 million from annual road levies and \$140,000 in County Arterial Preservation Funds. The total budget from all sources is about \$2.74 million per year for maintenance and local roadway improvements.

This amount is distributed throughout the county on all the county roads, so only a portion of these funds are spent in the metropolitan area. Asotin County has many of their lane miles in the metropolitan area, so approximately 50% of these funds make their way into improvements and maintenance activities within the MPO area.

### **Local Agencies in Idaho**

City of Lewiston: The City of Lewiston collects transportation revenues through a variety of sources, including the General Fund, Franchise Fees, Road and Bridge Taxes, and the Highway User Fund. Although funding is approximately \$4 million annually, Lewiston continues to struggle with funding street preservation and maintaining streets to an adequate standard. Lewiston continues to create partnerships with other agencies (i.e., Transit FTA funds, Urban Renewal, and Federal Highway funds), to create improvements to benefit all users of the transportation system. However, declining property tax revenues and no other revenue to replace it has created the need to use fund balances to offset expenses for operations and maintenance and to help with funding match dollars for Federal aid projects. Lewiston is rapidly approaching the end of its capital transportation fund balance (estimated at less than \$100,000 at the end of FY 2015), which will be the end of Federal aid projects without another source of revenue identified.

Nez Perce County: Nez Perce County appropriates revenue to the Road Fund from not only the Highway User Fund, but also from property tax and sales tax to maintain and improve their transportation system. Additionally, the County has partnered with various agencies seeking grants that benefit the County's road users. All the funds are placed into the General Fund for distribution to the various departments. No separate accounting is done on a department by department basis.

Nez Perce County has a budget of approximately \$4 million per year, covering maintenance and administrative costs. Administrative costs are roughly 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the budget and the rest is spent on maintenance. The majority of funding is spent on road maintenance, then on pavement preservation. Most of the funds for new construction are in the form of match for State or Federal funds to make the dollars stretch further. Approximately 4% of the County road miles are in the 27 year planning area for the MPO. For planning purposes we are estimating that approximately 10% of the maintenance and operations budget are spent within the metropolitan area.

**Table 1 Local Agency Revenue for Transportation**

Local Agency	Source	Amount	Total
City of Asotin	General Fund	\$85,000	\$85,000
City of Clarkston	Fuel Tax	\$150,000	
	Street Fund	\$450,000	
	<b>Total</b>		<b>\$600,000</b>
Asotin County*	Annual Road Levies	\$1,100,000	
	Fuel Tax	\$1,500,000	
	Arterial Preservation	\$140,000	
	<b>Total</b>		<b>\$2,740,000</b>
City of Lewiston	General Fund	\$1,287,000	
	Utility Franchises	\$580,000	
	ROW Permits	\$10,000	
	Road & Bridge Tax	\$360,000	
	Internal Services	\$500,000	
	Highway User Fund	\$420,000	
	Engineering Services	\$250,880	
	Water & Wastewater Fees	\$220,000	
	Interest Earnings	\$30,000	
	Other	\$132,700	
	<b>Total</b>		<b>\$3,790,580</b>
Nez Perce County*	General Fund	\$800,000	
	Highway User Fund	\$1,900,000	
	Property Tax	\$1,200,000	
	Sale Tax	\$100,000	
	<b>Total</b>		<b>\$4,000,000</b>
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$11,363,000</b>

\* Amounts are for the entire county

**Table 2: Local Agency Expenditures for Transportation**

Local Agency	Average Annual M&O Expenditures in the MPO Area
City of Asotin	\$85,000
City of Clarkston	\$600,000
Asotin County*	\$1,370,000
City of Lewiston	\$3,790,580
Nez Perce County*	\$400,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$6,145,580</b>

\* Amounts are expenditures within the MPO Boundary

## Transit Funding Sources

There are three primary funding sources available for funding the transit agencies two public transit agencies of the LCVMP. Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds, passenger revenues, and local funds that act both as matching funds and supplemental funds. Asotin County has passed a 0.2 cent sales tax that is used to generate a dedicated local matching fund. This is not an option in Idaho.

### Federal Transit Administration Funds

Small urban areas with populations between 50,000 and 200,000, including urbanized areas (UZAs) in Nez Perce and Asotin counties, are eligible for FTA Section 5307 funding. These funds are available for operating and capital expenses. Local match is required (50% for operating and 20% for capital) to receive these funds. For FY2015, the estimated Lewis Clark UZA allocation will be \$734,238. This allocation is split by population with the Idaho side receiving \$451,155, and the Washington side receiving \$283,083.

### Passenger Revenue Funds

Per federal regulation, passenger revenues cannot be used as matching funds, but are instead used in the operation of the transit system. Currently, the Asotin County PTBA and Lewiston Transit are both collecting approximately \$36,500 in passenger revenue per year.

### Local Funds

The availability of local match varies greatly between the Washington and Idaho communities within the MPO. With the creation of the Asotin County PTBA, local sales tax proceeds provide a substantial and dedicated source of funding for public transportation. Sales tax collected by the PTBA in 2013 was \$605,118, more than enough to match all available FTA funding. Such local option levies (e.g., sales or

property taxes) for public transportation are not permitted in Idaho. Many urban areas, including Lewiston, have difficulties assembling adequate local matches from City and County general funds.

Currently, the General Fund allocated to transit is approximately \$200,000 annually. In addition, Lewiston Transit collects an additional \$70,000 annually from program income from Medicaid, contracting with the PTBA for services, gas tax refunds, and facility and employee matching. The current Lewiston Transit federal funding exceeds operating costs.

**Table 3: Transit Agency Revenues**

<b>Transit Agency</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Est. FY2015</b>	<b>Est. FY2016</b>	<b>Est. FY2017</b>	<b>Est. FY2018</b>	<b>Est. FY2019</b>
Asotin County Public Transportation Benefit Area (PTBA)	FTA 5307	\$283,083	\$283,000	\$283,000	\$283,000	\$283,000
	Passenger Revenue	\$37,000	\$37,500	\$38,000	\$38,500	\$39,000
	Other	\$629,323	\$654,496	\$680,675	\$707,902	\$736,219
	Total	\$949,406	\$974,996	\$1,001,675	\$1,029,402	\$1,058,219
Lewiston Transit	FTA 5307	\$451,155	\$451,000	\$451,000	\$451,000	\$451,000
	Passenger Revenue	\$37,000	\$37,500	\$38,000	\$38,500	\$39,000
	General Fund/Other	\$277,000	\$281,000	\$285,000	\$289,000	\$293,000
	Total	\$765,155	\$769,500	\$774,000	\$778,500	\$783,000
Total Transit Funding within the MPO Boundary						
	Total	\$1,714,561	\$1,744,496	\$1,775,675	\$1,807,902	\$1,841,219

### **Additional Transit Funding Opportunities**

The purpose of this section is to explore additional federal funding sources that could be available in the Lewis-Clark Valley to support expanded transit services and help pay for capital improvements. Federal funding for transit systems is distributed primarily through the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). All recipients of federal funds must make certain certifications to the FTA, file regular reports and submit to periodic audits. Under Map-21, some sources also require a human services transportation coordination plan. There are many funding sources under FTA's umbrella, but a select few form the bulk of available operating and capital assistance. Lewiston and Asotin County currently rely on FTA Section 5307 along with a limited number of local funding for ongoing operations and capital improvements. The other sources include FTA Section 5310 – Elderly and Disabled Program and FTA Section 5339 – Bus and Bus Facilities Program.

## FY2015 – FY2019 Project List

The following tables are the proposed projects by State and project category for FY2015 – FY2019.

**Table 4: Project List -Idaho**

### Road

Key #: Project Description	Project Sponsor	Funding Category	Phase	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	PD
Key #: M 12009	ITD		PE						
US 12, 18th St. to Clearwater River Bridge - Resurfacing/Restoration			RW						
		RES	CN						1,600
Key #: 13440	Lewiston Lewiston	STP-U	PE		100				
Intersection at 16th Ave, & 17th St.		STP-U	CN					655	
Key #: 13441		STP-U	PE						
18 <sup>th</sup> St; Int. Idaho Ave & G St	Lewiston		RW						
Intersection at 16th Ave, & 17th St.		STP-U	CN				66		
Key #: 13442		STP-U	PE						
Orchards Interchange (Roundabout) at Powers Ave., Thain Rd,, and 14th street	Lewiston		RW						
		STP-U	CN		1875				
Key #: 13443		STP-U	PE						
	Lewiston		RW						
Snake River Ave. Southway to 11th		STP-U	CN						897
Key #: 13444		STP-U	PE						
Guardrail Replacement on Vineyard Dr. & Gun club Road	Lewiston		RW						
		STP-U	CN				95		
Key #: 13891			PE	13					
Intersection Thain & Bryden / Thain & Burrell	Lewiston		RW						
		LHSIP	CN	71					
Key #: 13895			PE						
	Lewiston		RW						
Intersection Thain Rd. & Grelle Ave.		LHSIP	CN	275					
Key #: 14338									
	Lewiston								
18 <sup>th</sup> Avenue Sidewalk Enhancement		TAP	CN	199					



Key #: Project Description	Project Sponsor	Funding Category	Phase	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	PD
Key #: H2040	Lewiston		PE			115			
9 <sup>th</sup> St. Grade; 5 <sup>th</sup> Ave to Idaho St.			RW						
			CN						995
Key #: 13435	ITD		PE						
			RW						
Lewiston Hill NB & SB Lanes Rehab, NPC		NH	CN	12,688					
Key #: 13876	ITD	NH	PE	20					
			RW						
US 12 Dike Route, Lewiston		NH	CN			949			
Key # H2080	ITD		PE	20	30				
			RW						
Spalding Bridge to Lewiston		NH	CN					4,683	
Key # H2090	ITD		PE	20	30				
			RW						
Lewiston & Moscow Concrete Grinding		STP	CN					1,248	

	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	PD
Total PE	73	160	115			
Total RW						
Total CN	13,233	1875	949	161	6,586	3,492
Total Programing	13,306	2,035	1,054	161	6,586	3,492

**Table 4 – Project List (Cont.)**

**Idaho (Cont.)**

**Transit**

Key #: Project Description	Project Sponsor	Funding Category	Phase	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	PD
Transit Operations Key #13776	Lewiston	5307	N/A	303	315	315	315	315	
Paratransit Key#13772	Lewiston	5307	N/A	45	45	45	45	45	
Preventative Maintenance Key #13773	Lewiston	5307	N/A	45	47	49	51	53	
Transit Capital Key#14211	Lewiston	5307	N/A	90	40	40	40	40	
Bus Purchase (ADA) Key #14210	Lewiston	5316	N/A		150				
Transit Facilities Key #13774	Lewiston	5307	N/A	400		400			
Transit Facility Planning Key #13775	Lewiston	5307	N/A	60		60			
Metropolitan Planning Key #12334	LCVMPO	5303	N/A	19	19	19	19	19	
Total Programing				962	616	912	466	912	

**Airport**

Key #: Project Description	Project Sponsor	Funding Category	Phase	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	PD
Runway 26-08 Resurfacing/blast pods	LNPCRAA	FAA	N/A						
Northside Apron Reconstruction	LNPCRAA	FAA	N/A						
ARFF Facility Building Design	LNPCRAA	FAA	N/A	100					
Order ARFF Equipment	LNPCRAA	FAA	N/A	650					
Acquire Snow Removal Equipment	LNPCRAA	FAA	N/A	250					
ARFF Facility Construction	LNPCRAA	FAA	N/A		1000				
Runway 12/30 Lighting System & Vault	LNPCRAA	FAA	N/A		1400				
Runway 12-30 Overlay	LNPCRAA	FAA	N/A		500				
Taxiway D & Midfield Apron	LNPCRAA	FAA	N/A			1050			
Taxiway Lighting System	LNPCRAA	FAA	N/A			532			
Total Programing				1000	2900	1582			

### Port of Lewiston

Key #: Project Description	Project Sponsor	Funding Category	Phase	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	PD
Key #:	Port of Lewiston		PE						26
Intersection Improvements			RW						
SR 128 & 18 <sup>th</sup> Street N			CN						86
Key #:	Port of Lewiston		PE						174
18 <sup>th</sup> St North Road Imp (SR128 to 3 <sup>rd</sup> Ave N)			RW						
			CN						578
Key #:	Port of Lewiston		PE						31
Intersection Improvements			RW						
SR 128 & 20 <sup>th</sup> Street N			CN						105
Key #:	Port of Lewiston		PE						136
20 <sup>th</sup> St North Road Imp (SR 128 to 3 <sup>rd</sup> Ave N)			RW						
			CN						452
Key #:	Port of Lewiston		PE						65
Intersection Improvements			RW						
SR128 & Col. Wright Way			CN						445
		Total Programing							2,098

### Idaho Total Programing

Key #: Project Description	Project Sponsor	Funding Category	Phase	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	PD
Road	N/A	N/A	N/A	12,786	2,035	115	161	6,586	5,715
Transit	N/A	FTA	N/A	962	616	912	466	912	
Airport	N/A	FAA	N/A	1000	2900	1582			
Port	N/A	N/A	N/A						2,098
Lewis-Clark Valley Metropolitan Planning	LCVMPO	FHWA	N/A	67	67	67	67	67	

Table 4 – Project List (Cont.)

Washington									
Road									
Key #: Project Description	Project Sponsor	Funding Category	Phase	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	PD
Key #: 0201	Asotin CO.		PE						
Fleshman Way/SR 129 Interchange			RW	130					
		STP-U	CN				9000		
Key #:0204	Asotin CO.		PE		10				
Southway Bridge Pavement Rehabilitation. Total cost shall be shared between the 4 bridge owners.			RW						
		STP	CN				6,300		
Key #: 0205	Asotin CO.	STP-E	PE			100	50		
Critchfield Rd./SR 129 Pedestrian/Bike Crossing		STP-E	RW				100		
		STP-E	CN				1,250		
Key #: 0220	Asotin CO.	HSIP	PE				75	75	
			RW						
6 <sup>th</sup> Avenue Sidewalk Project		HSIP	CN					1,150	
Key#: 0224	Asotin Co.	STP-US	PE				100		
Bike/Ped Pathway		STP-US	RW					100	
Evans Road		STP-US	CN						1,900
Key#: 0225	Asotin Co.	STP-US	PE					100	
Road widening/improvements for Bike/Ped Facilities			RW						
		STP-US	CN						1,100
Key #0226	Asotin Co.	STP-US	PE					50	
Bike/Ped Pathway		STP-US	RW						100
Dustan Loop to Elm St.		STP-US	CN						375
Key #: 0227	Asotin Co.	STP-US	PE				100		
Bike/Ped Pathway		STP-US	RW					200	
19 <sup>th</sup> Street to 16 <sup>th</sup> Avenue		STP-US	CN						700
Key #:	City of Asotin	TIB/SR2S	PE			39			
Pedestrian Pathway			RW						
Wilson St; 3 <sup>rd</sup> St to Riverpointe		TIB/SR2S	CN			215			

Key #: Project Description	Project Sponsor	Funding Category	Phase	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	PD
Key #:	City of Asotin	TIB-SCSP	PE	180					
Road Rehab/Sidewalk Improvements			RW						
2 <sup>nd</sup> Street; Washington to Harding		TIB-SCSB	CN	999					
Key #:	City of Asotin	STP/TIB	PE				83		
			RW						
Memorial Bridge Rehabilitation		STP/TIB	CN				460		
Key #: WA06548	City of Clarkston	local	PE	10					
			RW						
13 <sup>th</sup> Street Overlay		STP	CN	9	675				
Key #: WA07038	City of Clarkston	local	PE				10		
			RW						
Highland Avenue Resurfacing		TIB	CN					690	
Key #: WA07032	City of Clarkston		PE						
			RW						
5 <sup>th</sup> Street Improvements, North of Fair Street		Local	CN	15					
Key #: WA07035	City of Clarkston		PE		100				
			RW			110			
2 <sup>nd</sup> St. / US 12 Reconfiguration		STP	CN				395		
Key #: WA07047	City of Clarkston		PE					30	
			RW						
Signal Improvement 13 <sup>th</sup> Street & Highland Avenue		STP	CN						470
Key #: WA07043	City of Clarkston		PE	80					
			RW						
Sidewalk Improvements, 1200 Blk Poplar; Grantham Elementary Area		SR2S	CN		420				
Key #: 501214J02	WSDOT- SC	NHPP	PE			80			
			RW						
US12/SR128 Vicinity to Snake River Bridge - Paving. HMA overlay with safety restoration.		NHPP	CN				916		
Key #: 501216E02	WSDOT- SC	HSIP	PE			50			
			RW						
US12/SR128 Vicinity to Snake River Bridge ADA Compliance		HSIP	CN				500		

Key #: Project Description	Project Sponsor	Funding Category	Phase	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	PD
Key #: 512801D02	WSDOT - SC	NHPP	PE	213					
SR128/Snake River Red Wolf Bridge - Deck Rehabilitation			RW						
		NHPP	CN		2123				
Key #: 512901O02	WSDOT- SC	STP	PE	110					
SR129 Spur Intersection - Replace Signal and Lighting System			RW						
		STP	CN		678				
Key #: 512901W02	WSDOT- SC	STP	PE	3					
SR129/1.5 Miles S of Cemetery Road to 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street - Chip Seal			RW						
		STP	CN		43				

	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	PD
<b>Total PE</b>	596	110	269	418	255	
<b>Total RW</b>	130		110	100	300	100
<b>Total CN</b>	1023	3939	215	18821	1840	4545
<b>Total Programing</b>	1749	4049	594	19339	2395	4645

Table 4 – Project List

Washington (Continued)

Transit

Key #: Project Description	Project Sponsor	Funding Category	Phase	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	PD
Fixed route operations	Asotin CO.	5307	N/A	283	283	283	283	283	
Metropolitan Planning	LCVMPO	5303	N/A	12	12	12	12	12	
Total Programing				295	295	295	295	295	

Port of Clarkston

Key #: Project Description	Project Sponsor	Funding Category	Phase	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	PD
Key #:	Port of Clarkston		PE						
			RW						
Dredge Berthing Areas (4)			CN	215					
Key #:	Port of Clarkston	TAP	PE	35					
			RW						
Bike/Pedestrian Trail Dry Creek		TAP	CN	220					
Key #:	Port of Clarkston		PE				25		
			RW						
Road Rehabilitation 9 <sup>th</sup> Street & Port Way			CN				135		
Key #:	Port of Clarkston		PE				75		
			RW						
Crane Dock Improvements			CN				279		
Key #:	Port of Clarkston		PE						
			RW						
Pedestrian Facilities Port Way (south side)		TAP	CN						35
Key #:	Port of Clarkston		PE						
			RW						
Pedestrian Facilities Port Drive; 13 <sup>th</sup> Street to 15 <sup>th</sup> Street		TAP	CN						32
Total Programing				470			514		67

**Total Washington Programing**

<b>Key #:</b> <b>Project Description</b>	<b>Project Sponsor</b>	<b>Funding Category</b>	<b>Phase</b>	<b>FY2015</b>	<b>FY2016</b>	<b>FY2017</b>	<b>FY2018</b>	<b>FY2019</b>	<b>PD</b>
Road	N/A	N/A	N/A						
Transit	N/A	N/A	FTA	283	283	283	283	283	283
Port	N/A	N/A	N/A	470			514		67
LCVMPO Planning Funds	LCVMPO	FHWA	N/A	61	61	61	61	61	



## LEWIS-CLARK VALLEY MPO SELF CERTIFICATION

### Certification

LCVMPO certifies that the projects contained in the FY 2015-2019 Transportation Improvement Program are derived from the urban transportation planning program pursuant to Title 23 USC Section 134 and Title 49 USC Section 5303 which establishes the federally required metropolitan transportation planning program and the rules governing LCVMPO as the metropolitan planning organization.

LCVMPO further certifies that the projects contained within the FY 2015-2019 Transportation Improvement Program are derived from the long-range transportation plan specifically, or are consistent with the goals and policies to ensure the regional transportation system is operated and maintained in a manner that preserves and protects the existing transportation infrastructure to the extent of the available funds.

LCVMPO further certifies that the Lewiston Idaho-Clarkston Washington Urbanized Area is not classified as a non-attainment area based on the 1990 Clean Air Act as amended and therefore not subject to any related restrictions.

Certified by:  \_\_\_\_\_  
Shannon Grow, Director

Date: September 10, 2014